



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/560,170	04/28/2000	Mark D. Levitt	103-1345.00	3695

7590 09/22/2004

DAVID R. CLEVELAND  
IPLM GROUP, P.A.  
P.O. BOX 18455  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55418

EXAMINER
----------

AHMED, SHEEBA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1773

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/560,170	<b>Applicant(s)</b> LEVITT ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Sheeba Ahmed	<b>Art Unit</b> 1773	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE \_\_\_\_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2004 and 09 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-19 and 28-38 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 25,26 and 40 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 20-24,27,41-44 and 47-51 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 45 and 46 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/9/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

1. Amendments to claims 20-24, 27, 39, and 41-51 have been entered in the above-identified application. **Claims 1-51 are pending of which claims 20-27 and 39-51 are now under consideration.**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 20, 22-24, 27, 41-44, and 47-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bolgiano et al. (US 4,421,782).

Bolgiano et al. disclose flooring materials and a process for making such flooring materials whereby a substrate (***corresponding to the intermediate coating of the claimed invention***) is treated with a solution comprising water, acrylic acid and a surfactant (***corresponding to the topcoat of the claimed invention and meeting the limitations that the topcoat is UV curable and comprises an acrylate***). Upon irradiating the treated substrate, a tough and durable surface is formed (Column 2, lines 16-23). The substrate may be treated while on an intermediate support surface or when in place on a finished product (Column 3, lines 5-12). The aqueous acrylic acid solution comprises 0.1 to about

Art Unit: 1773

75 percent by weight of acrylic acid and from about 0.01 to about 5 percent by weight of a surfactant (Column 3, lines 48-51). The coatings are curable by UV irradiation (see Examples). Examples II states that the coatings were applied to a vinyl-flooring tile. With regards to the limitations that the polymerized top coat is less strippable than the intermediate coating when each is coated atop a vinyl tile and that the top coat can be at least partially stripped from the tile in 30 minutes when the two coating are coated atop the vinyl tile, the Examiner takes the position that such material property limitations must be inherently met by the coatings taught by Bolgiano et al. given that the chemical composition of the coatings as taught by Bolgiano and that of the claimed invention are identical. All limitations of claims 20-24, 27, 41-44, 47-51 are either inherent or disclosed in the above reference.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bolgiano et al. (US 4,421,782) in view of Koreltz et al. (WO 94/22965).

Bolgiano et al., as discussed above, do not state that their floor finishing system further comprises a strip agent.

However, Koreltz et al. disclose compositions used to strip coatings such as floor finishes and/or greasy residues from surfaces such as floors and the composition is effective in removing multiple coatings comprising urethane/acrylic polymers (Page 1, lines 5-9 and Page 3, lines 35-37).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to add the strip composition disclosed by Koreltz et al. to the floor finishing system disclosed by Bolgiano et al. given that such compositions can be used to remove multiple coatings comprising urethane/acrylic polymers.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. The rejections of claims 20, 22-24, 27, 39, 41-45, and 47-51 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamrock et al. (WO 98/11168) in view of Holman et al. (US 6,444,134 B1) and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamrock et al. (WO 98/11168) in view of Holman et al. (US 6,444,134 B1) and Koreltz et al. (WO 94/22965) have been withdrawn. The Declaration under 37 CFR 1.132 filed on June 30, 2004 is sufficient to overcome the above-mentioned rejections particularly given that the Declaration specifically points out that Hamrock et al. teach away from the use of waterborne or aqueous coatings.

Art Unit: 1773

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 25, 26, and 40 are allowed.

Claims 45 and 46 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sheeba Ahmed whose telephone number is (571)272-1504. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays and Thursdays from 9:30am to 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Deborah Jones can be reached on (571)272-1535. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Sheeba Ahmed

Art Unit 1773

September 18, 2004